



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,101	03/20/2006	Nigel Hugh Sanders	1307-5 PCT/US	2312
23869 7590 07/07/2009 HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP 6900 JERICHO TURNPIKE SYOSSET, NY 11791				
EXAMINER				
KRAUSE, ANDREW E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/07/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/533,101

Applicant(s)

SANDERS ET AL.

Examiner

ANDREW KRAUSE

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. **Claims 1-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aldrich (US #4,517,205) in view of Bollinger ('Comparison of Precrystallization of Chocolate', NPL 1)

4. Regarding claims 1-3, Aldrich discloses a method of preparing molded confectionary articles, comprising the steps of:

- a. Preparing a liquid candy composition which solidifies upon cooling, said liquid composition being at a first temperature (column 4, lines 51-65);
 - b. Preparing a second liquid composition which solidifies upon cooling (column 3, lines 25-40), said second liquid composition being at a second temperature which is lower than the first temperature (column 4, lines 62-66), wherein the liquid composition is chocolate (column 3, lines 30-35);
 - c. Co-depositing the liquid candy composition and the second liquid composition in molds (column 3, line 63 to column 4, line 5); and
 - d. Cooling the molded compositions in the molds so as to solidify the molded compositions to form molded confectionary articles (column 4, line 66- column 5, line 3). The examiner notes that although Aldrich does not explicitly disclose cooling the compositions, the compositions will intrinsically cool to room temperature following the deposition step.
5. During the co-deposition step, the chocolate composition is deposited through an orifice immediately prior to being introduced into the molds, and the action of feeding the chocolate composition through the orifice will subject it to a shear (column 3, lines 55-67). Aldrich is silent as to the degree of the shear.
6. Bollinger discloses subjecting chocolate to a high shear of 500 1/s in a narrow annular gap prior to molding the chocolate (p. 284, Table 4 (p.287)). It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the shear experienced by the chocolate composition in the depositor of Aldrich to a high shear level such as the 500 1/s disclosed in Bollinger, as the process of Bollinger results in a chocolate which has a low viscosity and good flow properties and excellent bloom resistance (p. 282 p. 2).

7. **Regarding claim 4**, Aldrich discloses that the candy composition is a hard candy composition (column 3, lines 4-10), and that the first temperature is 143° C (column 4, line 65).

8. **Regarding claim 5**, Aldrich discloses that the second temperature is 38° C (column 4, line 65-66). In the context of the specification and claims of the pending application, this temperature is within the range specified by the temperature of 'about 40° C'. *Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Caraco Pharm. Labs., Ltd.*, 476 F.3d 1321, 1326, 81 USPQ2d 1427, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 2007)

9. **Regarding claim 6**, Aldrich further discloses using milk based products like chocolate, therefore disclosing using milk chocolate, as a core ingredient (column 3, lines 30-35).

10. **Regarding claim 7**, Aldrich in view of Bollinger does not disclose adding dark chocolate to milk chocolate. However, the term "up to" includes zero as a lower limit, *In re Mochel*, 470 F.2d 638, 176 USPQ 194 (CCPA 1974).

11. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aldrich (US #4,517,205) in view of Bollinger ('Comparison of Precrystallization of Chocolate', NPL 1) and Franke (DE 19503635, English translation, and Derwent Abstract, hereafter Franke).

12. Aldrich and Bollinger disclose the method of claim 1, but fail to disclose adding fat to the chocolate composition prior to depositing it in molds. However Franke discloses production of chocolate compositions wherein liquid cocoa butter (fat) is added in an amount to comprise 4-15% of the chocolate mass (Derwent abstract, para. 2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Aldrich and Bollinger with the addition of fat as disclosed by Franke, because adding fat to the chocolate mixture transforms the chocolate from a pasty mixture to one that is pumpable (Franke translation, p. 3, para. 12). This addition of fat would occur before the step of depositing in mold.

13. **Claims 11-13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aldrich (US #4,517,205, hereafter Aldrich) in view of Bollinger NPL 1 and Cully (WO 96/39045, hereafter Cully).

14. **Regarding claim 11**, Aldrich and Bollinger disclose the method of claim 1, but fail to disclose subjecting the chocolate composition to a pre-shear prior to step (iii).

15. However, Cully discloses a method for processing chocolate which includes subjecting the chocolate to high shear prior to molding it (p. 2, lines 1-25, p.6, lines 5-10).
16. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Aldrich and Bollinger, with the application of pre-shear as disclosed by Cully, because subjecting the chocolate to pre-shear reduces the viscosity of the chocolate, resulting in improved smoothness (Cully, p. 1, line 3-8).
17. **Regarding claims 12-13**, the shear is disclosed to overlap this range between 3000-5000 1/s (Cully, p. 6, lines 5-10). This pre-shear is greater than the high shear of 500 1/s disclosed by Aldrich and Bollinger.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8,11-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW KRAUSE whose telephone number is (571)270-7094. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on (571)272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ANDREW KRAUSE/
Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/KEITH D. HENDRICKS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794